Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Combined with the Magazine ANALYSIS
Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066
VOL. VIII, NO. 38, *Issue Number* 399, SEPTEMBER 19, 1951 ★ *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN ★ *Associate Editor:* FRANK CHODOROV

SEP 25 '51

THE YEAR OF DECISION

By Edna Lonigan

The Republicans think they are going to win the election in 1952. The Fair Deal leaders know in 1951 how they are going to win it.

The Administration strategists have two million Federal employees carefully distributed all over the United States. They have a hundred billion dollar operating fund, every dollar of which is skillfully placed so as to best serve the planners' aim -- that is, to reduce all political subdivisions to "occupied areas".

The point to remember is that wherever Federal money flows, the opposition is silenced. State legislatures are still free, but State governors -- with a few distinguished exceptions -- do not bite the hand that feeds them. Governors, Democratic or Republican, dependent on Federal checks to balance their extravagant budgets, do not favor subordinates who criticize Federal policies. (Physicians in local Health Departments go easy on opposing socialized medicine while Washington supplies funds for hospitals. Road commissioners and welfare chiefs do not criticize Washington policies for similar reasons.)

Federal grants-in-aid to states and cities give Federal officials virtual control of the allocation; this results in practice to censorship of that healthy criticism of national policies that once came from state and local officials.

Payments to business firms, to colleges, to newspapers and magazines to be sent abroad (from ECA funds) are all designed for the same specific purpose. Foreign aid is of great help on the home front. The newspapers recently reported that $1,500,000 earmarked for aid to Burma went to an American engineering firm and a firm of New Deal economists to make "surveys". These economists had proved to the satisfaction of the Fair Dealers that wages can be raised without reducing profits or raising prices.

Every Federal check may be thought of as a pretty iridescent fly, baited on a hook that is firmly attached to a line held by party leaders who pull in the fish whenever the inevitable nibble is felt. Every subsidized section of American life -- political, economic, intellectual -- becomes in effect a satellite of the central government, bereft of any dissenting opinion.

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The manipulation, rather than the extent, of Federal power is our greatest concern. The Fair Dealers operate their vast machine on the grid system. The country is divided into "squares" or geographical areas, within which every political move can be watched by the government's agents, and every change in the political weather can be reported as soon as it occurs.

The strategy is derived from the operations of a police department: the city or state is divided into squares, or precincts, small enough so that a few men can cover every part of it. The precincts are all connected through a communications network to a single headquarters. Each area is presumably a net from which there is no escape. The purpose of the police, to be sure, is to wage war against crime, but the grid system works equally well when the purpose is war against dissidence.

Political watchmen in each precinct detect the smallest signs of trouble. Every hint of disbelief is promptly reported back to the next higher level. Every serious threat is quickly transmitted to the top strategists in Washington. Then the trouble-shooting begins. The doubter may be "captured" by being invited to join a select group going to Washington to give the State Department the benefit of his advice, or a club woman is sent abroad to tell European women about American "democracy". Or -- fresh ideas may be sent back to stiffen a faltering public opinion. Just about the time the public is thoroughly disillusioned about UNRRA spending, a brand new idea for spending called the Marshall Plan makes its appearance, and church groups are encouraged to "study" it under the auspices of laymen like Alger Hiss. Government propaganda is constantly improving because of the help of businessmen, club women and church people, whose ego are inflated by the kudos heaped on them.

By this grid system Congress is rendered nearly impotent. If a Member of Congress tries to cut a billion off foreign aid, that is unimportant. The Administration expects as much, knows it can always get the money the following year. But if a Member threatens a vital artery -- if, for instance, he opposes the system of grants-in-aid which keeps our local governments and private agencies in captivity -- then the alarm is sounded along inner channels, and the whole organized power of this vast political machine goes into action. Orders are sent out to every precinct, new reserves are brought in to man new "projects", prominent speakers are mobilized in his home district. The propaganda mills begin to grind, the work of dividing the offender from his colleagues in Congress is stepped up, sometimes by the simple method of excessive praise.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The timing is precise. In putting out the fires of political opposition, every minute counts. The Fair Dealers won the presidential election of 1948 partly because they went to work in time to win the mayoralty elections of 1947. In the primaries they made sure the "right" men were nominated. Then they sent their emissaries into women's clubs and civic bodies saying, "We must be non-political. We must not be the slaves of party labels, but must choose the best man."

Today, while the Republicans dream of 1952, the Fair Dealers are busy winning the decisive battles of 1951.

III

Obviously it is hard to organize the Resistance against a military machine with such financial advantage and such generalship, even when the people of the country are bitterly dissatisfied. Even so, the Opposition does not even know it is in a war.

The level of political thinking in this country may be illustrated by the letters which angry constituents write their Congressmen. "Why don't you put that man Acheson out of the State Department?" they ask. To which the obvious answer is, "Because in more than half the Congressional districts the voters chose President Truman and his foreign policy." The minority does not have any way to unseat representatives of the winning party.

When Martin Dies became a thorn in the flesh of the Administration, its political master-minds did not write angry letters. According to Joseph Gaer, historian of the PAC, they merely looked up the margin by which he was nominated in the previous primary, found it was 10,128; then 10,000 CIO-PAC workers and their families were drawn into the district by the judicious placement of war contracts. Dies did not return.

The political sagacity of the Resistance leaders is so low that they have found no way of thwarting Fair Deal penetration of the solid South, nor to prevent Me-Tooism from undermining the Republican state organizations and even its National Committee.

The Republicans try to operate in Congress with Me-Too Republicans sitting in every caucus and heading the minorities on some of the most important committees. In the House, Representative Jacob Javits, elected by the Liberal Party, won the Republican nomination because there were hardly any Republicans in his district, and he is a representative of the Republican Party on the important Foreign Relations Committee.

The Resistance still believes that our press, radio and magazines are free from government controls, that they will report the opinions of the Opposition as readily as they present official propaganda. The Ad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ministration operates on the theory that Mussolini made good use of. If a rising dictatorship can prevent a few clear-sighted, courageous leaders of the opposition from communicating with the people, the use of force is unnecessary. The confused middle group will go along, or flounder noisily about.

IV

H. G. Wells pointed out that decisive wars are fought, not between two armies face to face, but between supporters of things as they are, and an aggressive dynamic challenger using a wholly new strategy, usually the outgrowth of new kinds of weapons. The problem of the defenders then is not merely to resist but to think -- to grasp the new strategy as a whole, and invent a counter-strategy. If they depend on their existing stock of ideas they are lost.

The same principle holds in decisive political wars. When money became easy at the height of the Middle Ages, the petty feudal kings discovered that they could use gold and silver to hire mercenaries, armies which were politically more reliable than local feudal forces. They used the new political weapon of the mercenary army, unconcerned with honor or other scruples, to destroy the local leaders and build up the kingship. On the Continent the vast administrative apparatus of the kings effectively wiped out the local liberties of the Middle Ages.

Only in England did the Opposition develop a counter-strategy. When Charles I tried to impose on the English the bureaucratic centralism which his royal relatives had set up on the Continent, the people resisted. Rebellion would have been in vain, however, if the Opposition had not carried to new heights the grand strategy of self-government, what we now call the Bill of Rights and Parliamentary control of the purse (and so of the armies).

The political offensive today is using the powerful weapon of easy money to raise a political hired army, directed from the center to destroy the representative principle. There is no hope of success for the defenders of liberty if they rely on old weapons and tired ideas.

Whether the opponents of absolute power today will succumb like the opposition on the Continent, or carry the political philosophy and grand strategy of liberty to new heights, is the question of the hour. If they are to win, the defenders of liberty must find the counterattack soon, because every day the net closes tighter.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VIII, No. 38

By Frank C. Hanighen September 19, 1951

KOREA: We learn exclusively from naval sources that at least 20 submarines, presumably Russian, have been sighted in the seas around Korea. It is believed that there are between 50 and 60 submarines based on Vladivostok. Naval circles think (or maybe they just hope) that these undersea craft are only on training missions for breaking in Chinese Communist crews. No shots or torpedoes were fired.

Air Corps sources tell us that the Reds have more military aircraft on the Korean front than we have; and that they now have a number of rocket units.

General Ridgway has filed a disturbing report on the military situation in Korea, asking for more help -- in men and materiel. Pentagon people say the General filed this "for the record"; he could hardly expect to get this aid, unless the Defense chiefs were to reduce aid for Europe.

The above reports prompt military observers here to say that the Reds, if they open a real offensive, may be in a position to disrupt communications and supply, and to challenge our air control. It is all very well -- say these observers -- to warn the Soviets that, in case of such a Red offensive, we will bomb the other side of the Yalu. But it is a possibility that it may be a little late to adopt the strategy recommended by General MacArthur six months ago, when the enemy had no air force on the Korean front.

* * * * *

MACARTHUR: General MacArthur led Senator Taft in a newspaper poll for the 1952 GOP presidential nominees, conducted by the Manchester (New Hampshire) Union-Leader, the largest daily in that state. This outcome has surprised Washington political observers who had discounted the General as a political contender.

MacArthur drew 255 votes, while Taft trailed with 201. This score is all the more remarkable because the Union-Leader has been backing the Ohio Senator for the nomination. Also, neither MacArthur nor any of his friends have made any political moves to put him in nomination, whereas Taft's friends have been working industriously in his behalf -- with a possible draft of the Senator in prospect.

The New Hampshire paper's straw vote produced other surprises which cause political dopesters in the nation's Capital to reconsider their calculations about '52. General Eisenhower, regarded as the favorite in Eastern states, took fourth place in the Republican column, following MacArthur, Taft and Stassen (in that order). The European commander polled far less than half MacArthur's vote, with only 104. This showing offers further confirmation for the claim that the Eisenhower boom has been declining in the past month.

The Stassen performance was unexpected. Friends of the former Minnesota Governor plucked up hope (which had recently almost disappeared) and suggested that he might prove a compromise candidate between the eastern and western wings of the Party at the convention. Others were of the opinion that the vote for Stassen resulted from the very recent speeches given by the Governor in New Hampshire.

In the Democratic column of the Union-Leader's poll, Truman took first place with 34 votes and Eisenhower took second with 15. The slimness of the voting for Democrats is noticed. While traditionally New Hampshire has been a Republican state, Roosevelt took it in '36, '40 and '44. In the poll, there were only 74 Democratic votes cast as compared with 865 in the Republican column.

* * * * *

Copyright 1951 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EISENHOWER: Opponents of the Eisenhower boom are making one criticism of the General which might well back-fire. They are charging that Eisenhower on his own responsibility held back American troops from entering Berlin, Prague and other areas -- thereby allowing Red troops to capture those places. This charge is without foundation. The General's responsibility and power of decision at that time had been drastically limited by the direction of high authority. He was strictly bound to "hold back" by orders from the Pentagon. If these charges now being circulated continue, friends of the General will be in a good position to discredit them.

The fact is that in the early months of 1945, General Marshall issued staff directives which forbade American forces in Europe then advancing through Germany and Central Europe to proceed into those areas. Those directives did not really originate from Marshall himself, but came from experts on the General Staff in the Pentagon. All staff specialists, regardless of their views on Russia, agreed on the necessity for these orders, for the following reason: the political high command of the Allies, including Russia, had long before agreed in no little detail on the allocation of occupation areas among themselves; and had set, for instance, a demarcation line beyond which the commander of the Western forces was not permitted to operate. It was the final judgment of the Pentagon experts that the Western Allies had neither the political policy nor the military preparedness for a showdown with their big Eastern ally.

The little-known truth is that Roosevelt and Churchill had sold out these Central European areas to Stalin at Teheran. At that conference, late in 1943, the three leaders and their staffs had settled the allocation of the zones to be occupied after Germany's defeat. In the historical section of the Pentagon, there should be a map, executed in considerable geographical detail at the Teheran meeting. This served as a guide for the occupations. Once this map was approved by the Big Three, the Army -- Marshall, Eisenhower, et al -- had no other choice than to refrain from operating in the occupation zones assigned to Russia. (The one exception was in Thuringia; Western troops had to conquer this area so as not to leave an enemy pocket of resistance in their rear. Later, they handed it over to the Russians.)

But there was an equally potent reason -- never publicized -- why Eisenhower did not do what his critics think he should have done. After the Battle of the Bulge, Eisenhower did not really run the campaign. The now much admired General had disregarded Intelligence warnings that the Germans were preparing a counter-thrust in the Ardennes, had failed to take proper precautions and generally had shown his complete inability to direct the campaign.

If Pentagon archives were opened, they should reveal a highly blunt reprimand, sent in the early months of '45, by Marshall to Eisenhower. Marshall said in substance: "You are too weak to fill the position you are now occupying."

Accordingly, Marshall, after the Bulge, required that all military decisions by our GHQ in Europe should thereafter be cleared through the Pentagon. Marshall literally ran Eisenhower's final campaign by remote control. This remarkable fact may not be to the credit of Eisenhower, but it certainly absolves him of the charge of wilfully "holding back" as he moved into Eastern Europe.

* * * * *

REALIGNMENT: As accurately forecasted in HUMAN EVENTS, an important move in the game of creating an alliance between Republicans and Southern Democrats took place here last week end. There was set up the Committee to Explore Political Realignment, headed by former Senator Edward R. Burke of Nebraska. Observers here regard the fact that such a committee was formed at all as encouraging for Senator Mundt's crusade. The press accounts, however, left at least one obvious question unanswered.

Why are there no Southern Democratic members on the committee? (Those announced as forming the group are either Northern Democrats or Republicans.) The answer is: the Southerners present at the private meetings which set up the Committee are up to their armpits in Democratic politics in their own states, and -- in view of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Southern prejudice against association with the Republican label -- feel that public association with the Committee at this time would impair their usefulness. Later, if the coalition movement grows, the situation may be more favorable.

* * * * *

MARSHALL: Marshall's resignation inspired the hackneyed hosannas usual when a big war figure retires. Some publications, however, conceded that Marshall, although a good soldier, stumbled badly as a civilian official, as Secretary of State and emissary to China. We 'phoned General Bonner Fellers, writer and lecturer on military affairs, and contributor of a number of articles to HUMAN EVENTS. He gave a view on the Marshall myth refreshingly different from the others:

"Marshall is to be judged primarily as a soldier. But he is a poor soldier -- in the sense that he is a military reactionary. His concepts of war are essentially those of a Greek general of Homeric times. He can see no decisive element in warfare save ground forces. Air power is merely a 'subsidiary arm'. In short, he remains a 'bayonet fighter'.

"In the last war, he used to sum up our military policy as 'trading tanks for dead Germans'. That is, we should give all possible ground force materiel to Russia to decimate the Germans on the Eastern front. He never moved beyond that thinking to this day. The Eisenhower European Army plan is the same idea, is Marshall's idea -- massing of ground troops to offset the masses of Russian ground troops. I don't think it will work. But whether it does or not, it will ruin the economy of the U.S. -- in short it will ruin America. Military historians of the future will not deal kindly with Marshall the soldier."

* * * * *

LETTER FROM GERMANY: The diplomatic parleys last week in Washington sought some means of getting Germany into the European defense system and -- to further that objective (although this was not publicized) -- of allaying the sharp discontent of the German people with the Western Allied occupation rule. How the Germans feel may be seen in the following letter from a reliable German source:

"I am writing again because I must write my wrath off my heart. During the last fortnight a hailstorm of abuse has come down on the Adenauer Government. I can't imagine that such an accumulation of idiocies comes about in a casual and unorganized manner; that must be part of a system -- a system arising from the second and third levels of the bureaucracy of the American High Commission. The system is what remains of the long-discarded 'eye-for-an-eye' policy (or is it really discarded?); and this system apparently aims at making any understanding with the German people impossible.

"First of all, there is the coal-export quota, which no one who wants collaboration with the West can believe in. Then there was the dissolution of the Coal Sales office, which no one who knows the situation can find acceptable. Also, there was the new negative decision on the disposition of German property abroad; and the auctioning off of the movie studios on the pretext that the (non-existent) UFA monopoly should be broken up.

"There have been new occupation laws concerning regulation of hunting in Bavaria, in order to adjust the hunting customs to American hunting habits. Why, even the German divorce laws are being changed in accordance with American ideas. Add to this the creation of troop-practice fields and evacuation of entire villages to the Americans, as well as the erection of new barracks and confiscation of private houses and apartments for officers and non-coms. All this may be unavoidable, but it increases discontent.

"All this at the moment when the question of the raising of German contingents for the European Army are in the offing. Such decisions require approval by the West German parliament and a favorable public opinion. This just can't come out well!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The adherents of the old Morgenthau Plan, apparently headed by Mr. Buttenweiser, may achieve their evident goal -- to destroy everything that Adenauer and your Commissioner McCloy have built up so laboriously. They treat Germany not as a vanquished country but as a subjected country, which for all eternity should be kept in this state of subjection. A policy which is perfectly justifiable, if one is bent on revenge, is utter political madness if one wishes to align Germany with the West and expects her to contribute to the Western defense effort."

* * * * *

THE APPARATUS WORKS: We commented in this column (August 22) on the flood of letters received by the Saturday Evening Post in response to an editorial it ran, somewhat critical of the "progressive" educators. Since then, an article viciously attacking the opposition to the socialist infiltration of our schools has appeared in McCall's. The latter publication reports a big mail also, the correspondents being mostly favorable to the point of view expressed in the article. In the meantime, we learn of a postcard campaign conducted by the "defense committee" of the National Education Association (claimed membership, 800,000), the postcard urging the recipient to write letters of approbation to McCall's, of disapproval to the Post. Another national organization, allegedly devoted to combatting racial bigotry, also alerted its membership to the "danger" of the Post editorial and advocated "doing something about it". The obvious purpose of both campaigns was to influence the editors -- who are, of course, always conscious of the effect of reader reactions on circulation.

* * * * *

THE JITNEY RETURNS: Thanks to taxes, wage boosts and the monopoly position of the Chicago transit system, a trolley or bus ride in that city now costs the consumer 17 cents. Taking advantage of that rate, private cars and taxicabs are coming into illegal competition with the monopoly. They pick up passengers at the regular bus stops, not hesitating to cut in in front of the legal conveyance, at a fixed fee of 15 cents. They follow the regular bus routes. Besides being cheaper, the illegal entrepreneurs offer the advantage of a ride in a limousine, no straphanging, and speedier transportation. The newspapers suspect that the business is blessed by police "protection", the cost of which is probably no greater than the taxes levied on authorized busses . . . . Price controllers, please note.

* * * * *

WATCH FOR: Frazier (Spike) Hunt's broadcasts on world affairs over the new Liberty Network, three times a week, beginning Sunday evening, September 23. Hunt, a veteran foreign correspondent and radio commentator, was too critical of the Roosevelt foreign policy in 1940-2 for the major networks to keep him on after war broke out.

A new book by Felix Morley, The Foreign Policy of the United States, to be published by Alfred A. Knopf about November 12. This will be an expansion of the pamphlet by Mr. Morley (published earlier this year by the American Enterprise Foundation and mentioned in this column on April 25).

God and Man at Yale, by our recent contributor, Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., to be published by Henry Regnery Company on October 15. How atheism and collectivism, under the banner of "academic freedom", have taken over the curriculum at conservative old Eli.

A book on Senator McCarthy by Irene Corbally Kuhn, to be published by Devin-Adair. Mrs. Kuhn wrote the explosive exposé of the pro-Communist book racket which appeared in the American Legion Monthly last January.

Just published, a pamphlet, Morals and the Welfare State, by F. A. Harper. Free copies on request from the publishers, Foundation for Economic Education, Irvington-on-the-Hudson, N. Y.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED